The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was <u>not</u> written for publication and is <u>not</u> binding precedent of the Board.

Paper No. 32

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

MAILED BE	FORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES
JUL 3 0 2004	
U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFF BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES	parte MARK E. DAVIS, GLENN A. MERCY and MARC JABLONSKI
	Appeal No. 2004-0206
	Application No. 08/799,073
ON BRIEF	

Before HARKCOM, *Acting Chief Administrative Patent Judge*, WILLIAM F. SMITH and NASE, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

Per Curiam.

REMAND TO THE EXAMINER

The Office of the Group Director of Technology Center 2100 has requested that this application be remanded to the jurisdiction of the patent examiner so that the issues raised in this appeal can be reconsidered. Accordingly, we *remand*.

Application No. 08/799,073

If reconsideration by the examiner does not promptly result in the withdrawal of all pending rejections, the examiner must return this application to the jurisdiction of the Board so that the appeal may be restored.

REMANDED

GARY V. HARKCOM, Acting Chief

Administrative Patent Judge

WILLIAM F. SMITH

Administrative Patent Judge

) BOARD OF PATENT) APPEALS AND) INTERFERENCES

JEFFREY NASE

Administrative Patent Judge

clm

Appeal No. 2004-0206 Application No. 08/799,073

Gates & Cooper Howard Hughes Center 6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050 Los Angeles, CA 90045